



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/480,643	01/11/2000	Victor S. Moore	BOC990080US1	4561

7590 12/10/2003

ATTEN: RICHARD A. TOMLIN
IBM CORPOTION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
8501 CONGRESS AVENUE, IMAD-4042
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

CHILCOT, RICHARD E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/480,643	MOORE ET AL.
	Examiner Richard E. Chilcot, Jr.	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6, 9, 10 and 14-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6, 9, 10 and 14-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claims 1-6, 9, 10, and 14-21 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Fano and Carlton-Foss. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fano.

Fano teaches a system for communication of a proposed transaction in a local area. As seen in the summary of the invention of Fano, an agent running on a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) equipped with a Global Positions System (GPS) receiver, supports location targeted shopping in an outdoor mall. The agent assists shoppers by providing information about merchandise in which the shopper has expressed an interest. As a shopper strolls through a mall, the system alerts the shopper to merchandise of previously specified categories in the surrounding stores, as well as any cheaper alternatives in the local area. The system of Fano utilizes the user's precise physical location to filter the information it presents. Fano also teaches that alternative

shopping is available for products similar but not exact to the one requested. In Fano, it is noted to address the need of many shoppers to visit malls or shop generally without a particular destination in mind. FIG. 27 illustrates a display in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the invention. The display operates in a browse mode for use by shoppers as they stroll through the mall. In browse mode the system suggests items of interest for sale in the stores currently closest to the shopper. An item is considered to be of interest if it matches the categories entered in the goals screen. If there are no items of interest, the general type of merchandise sold at that store is displayed, rather than specific items. As the shopper strolls a map displays his or her precise current location in the mall. If an item displayed is selected by the shopper while browsing, the system alerts the shopper to the local retailer offering the same product for the lowest price, or announces the best local price. This search is restricted to the local mall, as that is the assumed radius the shopper is willing to travel.

It is also noted that the agent will support broader aspects of the shopping task, for example, it could operate as bi-directional channels. That is, not only can they provide information to the shopper, but, at the shopper's discretion, they may provide information to retailers as well. In this embodiment, the system indicates a shopper's goals and preferences to a retailer-based agent, who, in turn, responds with a customized offer that bundles service along with the product. Enabling the customization of offers is crucial to gaining the cooperation of retailers who are reluctant to compete solely on price and of value to customers who base their purchases on criteria other than price. While the preferred embodiment focuses on location-based

filtering primarily in the context of the shopping task, the current invention provides the basis for "physical task support" agents that provide an information channel to people engaged in various tasks in the physical world.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fano in view of Carlton-Foss.

As noted above Fano teaches all of the elements of the claimed invention with the exception of "transmitting information on said first bid to a second merchant" and using a cellular telephone as the wireless device.

However, Carlton-Foss is submitted to demonstrate the well-known, networked based competitive bidding process which includes notification of a first bid (offer) by one merchant (supplier) to a second merchant supplier). Specifically, attention is invited to col. 3, lines 50-68 of Carlton-Foss which teaches a reverse auction engine in communication with the request database and the bid database, and a security manager that allows requestors to designate whether a request shall be generally available and to designate the parties who shall have access to bid on it, and a display system that displays selected information from the request database and the bid database to appropriate requestors and bidders so that the bidders are encouraged to compete in an open marketplace and the requestors may witness the bidding and alter the environment of that bidding before and during the time of the competitive bidding process.

Accordingly, to provide the system of Fano with a competitive bidding process, such as the one shown in Carlton-Foss, would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The motivation for such a change in Fano can be seen in column 1, lines 1-4 of Carlton-Foss, which teaches the advantage of this system is that it results in greater value for requestors, as well as greater sales

and broader distribution for sellers who are prepared to be competitive in their offerings. By incorporating an auction format, which is available to a wide audience by electronic means, the inventive system results in more bidders, greater response, and hence lower costs and greater value for the requestor.

Regarding the particular type of wireless communication systems used, such as a cell phone. Blue tooth, Wi-Fi, etc., these systems are functional equivalents for one another. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill to pick any desirable wireless system to be employed by Foss.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 9, 10 and 14-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ginglesperger teaches a competitive bidding process from a plurality of vendors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard E. Chilcot, Jr. whose telephone number is 703-305-4716. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 1st Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1020.



Richard E. Chilcot, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3627